

	Billions
Unexpended balances of funds already appropriated	\$46.0
Authorizations already enacted to spend from so-called debt receipts, and from other sources	24.0
Total	145.5

These figures do not include various trust funds such as social security, etc.

The Federal debt is \$276 billion. The contingent liabilities by guaranties of various Federal borrowing programs is \$260 billion.

Our national income in 1956 was \$325 billion, so our various governments are collecting in taxes in cash more than one-third of the national income.

I do not believe the free enterprise system can long survive under such tax burdens. Most corporations now pay taxes, in all forms—Federal, State, and local—of more than 60 percent of their net revenue, and some individuals pay over 90 percent.

In the face of these conditions, it is foolhardy in the extreme to continue to spend on this high level.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I ask you for a detailed report of the economies actually made effective by adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. President Hoover has stated that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission point the way to saving in governmental expenditures \$5.5 billion annually.

I have been unable to find in the budget where any of these recommendations have been incorporated. I would like to be enlightened as to this.

I firmly believe the pending budget should be reduced by at least \$5 billion, and this would leave an expenditure budget \$2 billion more than 1955.

I hopefully await the results of your investigations and word from you and the President as to how the pending budget can be reduced.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

EXHIBIT 4

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1968.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am replying to your telephone inquiry as to the application of the proposed expenditure reduction to an agency such as the TVA which to some extent at least generates its own revenues.

Expenditures by the TVA (on a net basis insofar as power revenues are concerned) are included in the unified budget. For that reason, expenditures by the TVA could be made subject to some portion of the \$6 billion expenditure reduction. The question as to which agencies some portion of the \$6 billion reduction would apply is determined by the action taken by Congress with respect to appropriations and other provision for obligatory authority. To the extent the action by Congress may not fully account for a \$6 billion reduction in expenditures, it would be up to the President to determine the allocation of any additional reduction necessary to achieve the \$6 billion goal. He could presumably do this by reducing specific programs or on an overall basis by requiring agencies to make some percentage reduction (perhaps only with respect to controllable programs). As a result, he could, but would not be required to, allocate some of this reduction to the TVA. He could do this in a manner which would permit TVA to offset any reduction it otherwise might have to make in expenditures by any increase in power receipts which it receives. On the other hand, he could make the allocation without regard to an increase in power revenues.

The provision relating to employee reductions does, under the conference agreement, apply to the TVA. In other words, the TVA in the case of its permanent, full-time employees would be permitted to fill three vacancies out of four until such time as the level of employment generally reached the level of June 1968. In the case of temporary or part-time employees, they would be limited to the same number they had in the corresponding month in 1967. However, either in the case of permanent full-time employees or in the case of part-time or temporary employees the Director of the Bureau of Budget could reassign vacancies to be filled to the TVA from some other agency, if he found this necessary or appropriate to increase the efficient operation of the government.

To summarize, no part of the proposed \$6 billion reduction in expenditures would have to be assigned to the TVA, although the President in his discretion could so assign some portion of the reduction. The employee reductions would, if no action is taken to the contrary, affect the TVA, but the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could prevent any such reduction by reassignment if he considered it necessary or appropriate to efficient government operation.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware on his remarkable presentation and his cogent and effective criticism of the present posture and status of the fiscal situation in this country.

As always, he has done a magnificent job in this analysis, and has given all of us the basis for judging the next steps in and the necessities of a dangerous situation.

I especially at this point wish to underscore briefly the fact that I understand that there have been a number of calls by administration officials to many Members of Congress—I know there has been a call to this Member of Congress pointing out that funds for the Erlanger Hospital in Chattanooga would be cut or would not be funded in fiscal 1969 until "the Congress was able to work out what it is going to do" about this expenditure reduction-tax increase thing. This is from a representative of HEW in a call to my office on Friday, May 17.

I make no criticism of the administration in this respect, except to say that the time has come, in my judgment, when the executive department must specify the cuts, in the best and the least disruptive manner, that will accomplish the purposes of this obviously needed reduction in expenditures and increase in taxation.

On one other subject, I thank the Senator from Delaware for pointing up the situation with respect to TVA. This is not a case of asking that TVA be excluded. On March 29, 1968, I introduced, and the Senate adopted, an amendment that made it abundantly clear that the internal funds of TVA, generated from power operations, the sale of power bonds and notes, were not affected, because they are not part of the administrative budget. This, I understand, has been stricken in conference.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for once again, with his letter from the

staff of the Joint Economic Committee, making it abundantly clear that TVA's internal funds, power funds, revenues from the sale of bonds and power notes, are not affected by the proposed decrease in expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not affected any more than they would have been under the proposed \$4 billion reduction or, for that matter, under existing law except as to degree. I quote from the last paragraph of the letter just placed in the Record.

To summarize, no part of the proposed \$6 billion reduction in expenditures would have to be assigned to the TVA, although the President, in his discretion could so assign some portion of the reduction.

That also would be true of the \$4 billion. It could be true of the existing law, if we assume that we killed the conference report and made no reductions. In approving this reduction we specifically made no exceptions but left to Congress and the executive branch an opportunity to work out the system of priorities, as to where they will apply the reductions, as the Senator knows.

The bill did spell out, however, that social security payments and veterans' benefits as provided under existing law would not be affected, but these were not considered exceptions since they were already mandatory. The bill did provide that the special costs of the Vietnam war and the interest on the national debt would not be included since they were both recognized as uncontrollable items.

I thank the Senator for his remarks, and I thank him for calling attention to the particular project in his State with respect to which he received notice that it would be canceled if we retained the \$6 billion expenditure reduction. I am aware of the fact that many Members of Congress are receiving such calls. I have received some calls from agencies in our State that they are receiving notice from Washington that if expenditures are reduced by \$6 billion their programs will be cut by x amount. This practice is nothing but an indirect attempt on the part of the administration to defeat a bill which it does not have the courage to face up to in an election year.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 917) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 7½ minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

May 21, 1968

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield a like amount of time to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on a subject which is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on Friday, May 17, the Senate passed S. 3068. The bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without amendment, and was passed by the Senate without amendment. However, there was a mistake in printing the bill, as reported, so that as printed it differed from the bill as introduced.

In order to correct the Record, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which S. 3068 passed the Senate on Friday, May 17, be reconsidered, together with the third reading; that the bill be amended by striking from line 5, page 1, the figure "\$255,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000"; and that the bill be read a third time and be repassed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3068), as amended, read the third time, and passed, is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by deleting the phrase "not in excess of \$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "not in excess of \$245,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings tomorrow on a Senate joint resolution relating to East-West trade. The resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] states:

Public misconceptions plague efforts to expand East-West trade.

And it resolves that the Export Control Act regulations and the Export-Import Bank finance restrictions should be modified to permit an increase in trade between the United States and the nations of Eastern Europe.

As a businessman, and as one who through the years has been an exporter, I believe strongly in the elimination of trade barriers wherever possible.

I think it important that there be trade between the nations of the world. I favor trade.

One of the businesses in which I am involved, the growing and selling of apples, tends to prosper when there are good export possibilities, and it suffers in those years when the export volume is small.

So I do not speak as one who is hostile to trade among the nations of the world. I speak as one who favors trade among the nations.

Now, the Senator from Minnesota in his address to the Senate on May 9 when he presented Senate Joint Resolution 169, made a sharp attack on legislation which I introduced last August and which the Senate approved last August, and which the House of Representatives likewise approved. He made a sharp attack, too, on legislation offered by the Senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], of which I was cosponsor.

In adopting the Byrd amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act, the Senate simultaneously did two things: First, in a sharp, clearcut fight, it voted to limit the President's authority and thus asserted its own constitutional prerogative in the field of foreign affairs; and, second, it made unmistakably clear that American tax dollars shall not be used for the benefit of nations supplying our enemy.

This amendment, along with the Mundt-Byrd amendment, prevented the use of Export-Import Bank funds to build or equip a Fiat automobile plant for the Soviet Union.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that Export-Import Bank funds are funds which come from the pockets of the taxpayers, from pockets of the wage earners of the United States.

The Byrd amendment would prohibit the use of tax funds to finance trade with nations supplying North Vietnam—so long as North Vietnam is at war with the United States.

I would automatically cease to be operative with the ending of the Vietnam conflict. Nor would the legislation enacted by the Congress apply to trade with any nation except those nations which supply an enemy at war with the United States.

This amendment does not restrict trade.

It says the American wage earner's dollar that he pays to the Government in taxes shall not be used to finance trade with those nations which are supplying the American enemy. Trade can continue, but the American taxpayer will not finance it.

The Senator from Minnesota in his Senate speech said:

The harshest restrictions (the Byrd Amendment and the Mundt-Byrd Amendment) coming from Congress have ended Export-Import Bank assistance for exports to Communist countries.

I say again, Mr. President, why should American tax money be used to finance trade with countries—be they Communist or non-Communist—which are supplying North Vietnam?

Let us put this matter in perspective. The United States is involved in a major war in Vietnam.

The United States has 500,000 American troops fighting in Vietnam, and

through May 11 our casualties totaled 165,483.

During the 2-year period 1966 and 1967, U.S. casualties totaled 106,000 or an average of 1,000 per week.

For the first 19 weeks of 1968, the United States has suffered 48,560 casualties in Vietnam, or an average of 2,500 casualties a week.

Without aid from the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc countries, North Vietnam would not be able to continue the war against the United States.

The Soviets supply almost all of North Vietnam's surface-to-air missiles, radar, rockets, mortars, fighter aircraft and anti-aircraft guns and ammunition.

The basic weapon of the Vietcong, the AK-47 automatic rifle, is made in Czechoslovakia. That weapon has been judged by our own military men to be as good or better than the M-16 rifle carried by most of our own troops in Vietnam.

Among European Communist countries, Poland is second only to the Soviet Union in the number of ships carrying cargo to North Vietnam.

Why should the American taxpayer, whose sons and brothers and husbands are being wounded and killed daily in South Vietnam have their own money used to finance trade with those nations which are supplying war materials and other cargo to the North Vietnamese?

I realize that some American companies are having their profits reduced because of the Byrd amendment approved by the Congress last year.

But where American lives are involved, I am not concerned about business profits.

Another point the Senator from Minnesota makes is that the Byrd amendment eliminated the President's discretionary authority.

Most certainly it did.

I say the Congress of the United States—the Senate of the United States—has surrendered too much to the President—be he Democrat or Republican. The Senate should cease giving blank checks to the President.

I say it is time that the Senate and the Congress began to correct the imbalance which exists between the executive and the legislative branches.

The Byrd amendment was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 56 to 26. I might say that arrayed against it on that 10th day of August of last year was the full power of the White House and the State Department.

Yet the amendment was approved with 6 percent of the Democrats voting in favor of it and 72 percent of the Republicans voting favorably. It was passed by a bipartisan vote.

It was clear last August and it is clear today that powerful men in our Government—powerful businessmen with millions of dollars at stake—are opposed to the Byrd amendment and sought its defeat and now, presumably, seek its repeal.

The chairman of the Banking Committee in the House of Representatives, an opponent of the Byrd amendment, said last August in a surprisingly frank public statement that he was depending on what he called the "fat cats," presum-

May 21, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

ably wealthy businessmen, to bring enough pressure to kill the Byrd amendment.

They may be able to do that.

The speech by the Senator from Minnesota is the opening gun to make it possible to use American tax dollars to finance trade with Communist nations supplying North Vietnam.

I do not underestimate the power of the administration.

I do not underestimate the power of those whom the chairman of the House Banking Committee calls "fat cats."

But I say this, that if the American people understand that the tax dollars taken out of their pay checks—withheld from their wages even before they see their wages—are being used to finance trade with a nation which is inflicting on the American people 2,500 casualties every week, then I say the American taxpayers will rise up and defeat the "fat cats."

I say again, as I said in the beginning of my speech: I favor trade. I favor the expansion of trade. I favor the nations of the world having as much commercial intercourse with one another as is possible.

The Byrd amendment does not prevent trade. It does, however, prevent the use of American tax dollars to finance trade with nations supplying our enemy.

Until the Vietnam war is concluded, I shall fight to retain this restriction.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he has just made. This subject has been a continuing source of concern to me, as I am sure it is to many of us, as evidenced by the support of the Senator from Virginia received on his amendment.

I believe I saw in the newspapers the other day that the Commerce Department had issued either a permit, or rules and regulations, which would authorize a permit for the United States to go ahead with the financing of the Fiat plant in the Soviet Union. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Not precisely so. I think what was done was that the Commerce Department granted an export license to permit the exporting of machine tools, but there will be no Government financing involved. I think that is the distinction, which comes about as a result of the amendment the Senate adopted, which the able Senator from Colorado himself was so helpful in having adopted. Because of that amendment, the Export-Import Bank is prevented from helping to finance the deal.

My understanding is similar to that of the Senator's, that the Commerce Department has granted an export license to the Soviet Union for the building of the Fiat automobile plant, but the American taxpayer cannot help to finance it as long as the amendment continues on the statute books.

Mr. DOMINICK. Again I congratulate the Senator from Virginia on having been able to stop the use of tax funds in connection with the construction of this plant. But I must say that, at a time

when we are engaged in war in South-east Asia, for U.S. industry to send machine tools to the Soviet Union for construction of the Fiat plant, which will be fully capable of building Fiat trucks as well as cars, it seems to me we are being awfully shortsighted; that in the desire to make more American dollars we are losing sight of our overall national interest.

I sincerely trust that the Senator from Virginia will continue his valuable efforts along these lines which I wholeheartedly support. Perhaps, over a period of time, with enough publicity given this matter, the American people will insist upon governmental action which will back up the theory behind the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I greatly appreciate the comments of the able Senator from Colorado. I am grateful for them. I concur wholeheartedly in what he says.

Why should any American company, when the United States is at war, and we are suffering 2,500 casualties every week, export tools and other equipment to the Communist nations which are supplying the enemy and making it possible for North Vietnam to continue to kill American soldiers in South Vietnam?

I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Colorado. I feel that what he has said will be tremendously helpful in the fight to protect Americans in South Vietnam.

Mr. DOMINICK. Like the Senator from Virginia, I am in favor of trade among nations, particularly when trading between private investors here and private investors and individuals abroad. But, is it not a fact, in connection with Communist-controlled countries, that one does not trade in that manner, it is trade only between individuals and businesses here and the Government-controlled corporation run by the Communists in the satellite countries or in the Soviet Union where there are no private business leaders with whom we can trade?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator is completely correct. The governments of those Communist countries control the trade. They say how it will be utilized. We know that it will be utilized to their own advantage in this case, which will mean it will be utilized to the disadvantage of the United States.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I appreciate the Senator's comments very much.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 917) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk four amendments and ask that they remain on the desk during the day until we can conclude with some voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from Rolland Truman, court commissioner, Long Beach, Calif.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SUPERIOR COURT,
Long Beach, Calif., May 2, 1968.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: All of our law-abiding citizens, including innocent children, are indebted to you for your tireless efforts to swing back the pendulum of justice to at least a middle-of-the-road course so that our U.S. Supreme Court decisions will no longer be in favor of the criminals. Your two-fisted fighting leadership in this matter is greatly appreciated.

May God bless you with success in having the Senate approve the controversial Title II of the Anticrime Bill, as reported in today's issue of the Los Angeles Times.

Sincerely yours,

ROLLAND TRUMAN.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John C. Bell, Jr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 9, 1967.

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: I enthusiastically endorse your attempts and your proposal to overturn recent Supreme Court decisions invalidating, on recently created technicalities made of straw, voluntary confessions which are made by brutal criminals. These technicalities which four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States have declared to be unconstitutional, drastically weaken the protection of the law-abiding public from murderers, robbers, rapists and other dangerous criminals, and make a travesty of Justice.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BELL, JR.,
Chief Justice.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief quorum call, the time to be equally divided between sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for 2 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the two sides, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the nomination.

May 21, 1966

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of Manuel Frederick Cohen, of Maryland, for reappointment as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term of 5 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND
SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 917) to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The time will have to be charged equally against both sides, unless someone takes it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] wishes 5 minutes. I yield the Senator 2½ minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield my colleague an equal amount of time.

THE CRIME PROBLEM IN
WASHINGTON

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday, a group of women whose husbands drive buses for the D.C. Transit Co. visited me in my office. They were upset, and justifiably so. A busdriver was killed in this city last week. On that same night, five others were held up. The women who came to see me were alarmed and frightened. They demanded that something be done to help protect their husbands on their jobs.

I have written to the president of the D.C. Transit Co., and to the Mayor of the District of Columbia, urging their prompt action on some of the improvements in law enforcement and protection that the women suggested.

The dangers that bus drivers face in this city every night are just part of the problem. Crime, in fact, is a serious and growing problem in Washington.

It is shocking and deplorable that this should be the situation in the Nation's Capital. But it is.

Despite the best efforts of the police department, crime flourishes here.

Despite comments to the contrary by some public officials who have seriously misjudged the situation, the citizens of Washington and its suburbs lack confi-

dence in the ability of an overworked, undermanned, and underpaid police department to protect life and property here.

It was with surprise and concern that I noted a statement made last week by one of the junior members of the House District Committee, who happens to come from the State of Maryland. He said that the Washington community can feel a considerable degree of confidence that law and order will be maintained.

That statement was made last Thursday. That night, a busdriver was killed and five others were held up. That day and night, six fires of suspicious origin were reported in the city.

Mr. President, can a busdriver feel confident as he drives his route, when one of his coworkers has been slain and others are the victims of holdups almost every night?

Can a merchant feel confident behind the counter in his store when four others like him have been killed in the last month?

No citizen can feel confident in a city that is plagued day and night by shootings, holdups, assaults on women, cases of arson, and assorted other crimes that continue despite the best efforts of the police to prevent them.

This is no time for expressions of confidence. It is time for expressions of deep concern as well as concerted action.

The police department is striving valiantly to control the crime situation in this city. Its officers and men deserve the highest commendation for their efforts under extremely difficult conditions.

Clearly, the best deterrent to crime is the policeman on the street. It is essential that more policemen be put on the streets of Washington as soon as possible.

The fact remains, however, that there simply are not enough policemen in Washington. The force is seriously undermanned. The vacancies that exist on the force now must be filled. The authorized strength must be increased, and then the new positions must be filled.

This is the only way that Washington can begin to come to grips with its crime problem quickly and effectively.

The officials of this city already have taken several steps to put more men on the streets and to increase the protection on the buses. The public safety director said last week that the city is reviewing the possibility of obtaining more policemen.

It is my hope that city officials will come to a decision quickly on this matter. They should come to Congress with a request for an increase in the authorized strength of the police department. Congress should approve that request without delay.

Along with more men, Congress must assure that the members of the police department continue to receive salaries that are equal to the duties they must perform. The Congress has approved an increase in police salaries this year. Concern for the working conditions of the policemen in Washington must be continuous.

Mr. President, the Washington Post and the Washington Star, on May 18,

both contained editorials addressed to the subject I have discussed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Needed: More Protection," published in the Washington Post of May 18, 1968, and an editorial entitled "Safety on the Buses," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 18, 1968.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
May 18, 1968]

NEEDED: MORE PROTECTION

The fear and frustration which has so suddenly gripped Washington bus drivers is shared in large measure by other segments of the Washington community. There is a widespread feeling that the city is not getting the protection it needs. Are there enough police? Is enough use being made of the right kind of protective devices in shops, buses or taxis? The feeling of a lot of people is that the answer to both questions is No. This feeling comes in part as an aftereffect of the breakdown of law and order during the riots, but it also stems from a continuously increasing rise in serious criminal activity over the years. Housebreaking, auto thefts, robberies and larcenies averaged about 900 a week earlier this year. They now average over a thousand a week.

Certainly after six holdups and the murder of a bus driver in one night, the city must provide the added protection demanded by the bus drivers. The temporary manpower available through massive extensions of overtime, announced yesterday by Deputy Mayor Fletcher, should help relieve the immediate emergency. But if the city is to serve those other segments of the community whose fears are just as real as those of the bus drivers, the police force must be enlarged, and enlarged substantially. The police acted with admirable speed and efficiency last night in apprehending three suspects. Even before yesterday's shooting, police had assigned a special task force of plainclothesmen to ride buses in the high hazard areas of the 9th, 11th and 14th precincts of the Northeast and Southeast sectors of the city. Their effort has been rewarded with several arrests. But a concomitant result has been that already inadequate police forces have been spread even thinner. And as the murder at 20th and P only serves to show, the pattern of criminal attack is far from predictable. The only relief for this uneven balance, then, is to increase police ranks. This must be an issue of priority for city and government officials.

As to the physical protection which the bus drivers seek, there are any number of devices which might help deter criminals, such as shatterproof plastic cages for drivers or two-way radios for quick communication. District buses are equipped with machines that collect fares which are inaccessible to the driver except by key. The Transit Commission might well insist that the contents of these machines be completely inaccessible, even to drivers, and that drivers on "owl" runs be prohibited from carrying money on their person, thus removing the bait for criminals. To effect this, the Commission could insist that passengers on night buses pay exact fares. Tokens might be sold at stores and restaurants to relieve the driver of the necessity of handling money.

A high proportion of robberies occur at bus terminal points. Schedules could be altered to prevent layovers, or terminals themselves might be relocated in areas where police can more easily provide protection.

Whatever the solution, the bus drivers, the merchants and the citizen who wants to walk the street deserve better protection. The rise in crime must be brought to an end. Already Mayor Washington and Safety Director Mur-